

RESPONSE/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the invention.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephonic interview at which time the protocol normalizer limitation was discussed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10 and 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brooks et al. US 2003/0210139 A1 (Brooks).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3 and now recites: "the event generator further comprises a protocol normalizer and a data stream converter coupled to the protocol normalizer and adapted to receive data from a field device." Applicants' protocol normalizer and data stream converter advantageously allow Applicants' inventive web based security system to interface with and control legacy devices and legacy subsystems such as the conventional legacy security system described by Brooks.

Applicants have reviewed the Brooks reference and respectfully submit that Brooks is silent on the normalization of protocols. Brooks contains no reference to protocols. A single reference in Brooks paragraph [0032] describes normalizing security ratings. In contrast, Applicants' protocol normalizer and data stream converter convert and process data from legacy devices to generate high level events and control signals which can be processed by a network based security system. Additionally, Applicants' protocol normalizer "processes the converted data stream using a mapping function in conjunction with the local database 176. The mapping function detects and processes state changes. The state changes are transformed into portal events which are subsequently processed by the finite state portal controller 162." (Specification page 17 line 28 – page 18 line 2).

Applicants' specification describes in some detail the function of the protocol normalizer: “Protocol normalization is a process by which legacy field devices 116 are made accessible to the integrated security system 100 for one or more of the integrated security applications (e.g. access control). The protocol normalization process maps input data streams and between the protocol adaptor 114 and the legacy field devices 116 into portal events and signals to control legacy field devices 116. The protocol normalization process also maps commands from the network security controller 110 into signals to control legacy field devices 116 resources at a portal.” (Page 18 lines 17-23) (Emphasis added)

and

“In one embodiment, the signal interface 168 is an RS-485 interface. It will be appreciated by those of ordinary skill in the art that an alternative serial interface, for example, RS-232, RS-422 or network interface can be substituted for the RS-485 interface. The RS-485 interface is coupled to the legacy field device 116. The operation of the protocol adaptor 114 is described further in conjunction with FIG. 6. The signal interface 168, in one embodiment, is an asynchronous receiver transmitter (UART) using an RS-485 multi-drop protocol, communicates with a plurality of legacy field devices 116, each legacy field device 116a-116j having a unique address. The data stream converter 166 processes an access control event 175 from the legacy field devices 116, calculates and checks the CRC for some legacy field devices 116. Some legacy field devices 116 require a polling sequence which is generated by the data stream converter 166. A local action is processed by the data stream converter 166 resulting in a local action field device signal 177 being transmitted to the legacy field device 116.” (Page 17 line 14-26) (Emphasis added)

As Claims 4-11 depend from allowable Claim 1 and cite additional structure, they too are allowable for analogous reasons.

It is noted that method claim 12 includes the equivalent limitations of "normalizing the data stream to provide at least one portal event... converting a field device signal representing the access control event to a data stream." As Claims 13-20 depend from allowable Claim 12 and cite additional steps, they too are allowable for analogous reasons.

Applicants believe that the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, and 4-20.

Based on the preceding remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

#### CONCLUSION

In summary, the above-identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration is respectfully requested for all the reasons set forth above. If the Examiner believes, after this Response, that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants Representative at the number below. If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (857) 998-7735.

Respectfully submitted,  
S2 Security Corporation  
/Barry Gaiman/  
Barry Gaiman  
Registration No. 42,562  
Attorney for Applicants

July 13, 2008  
S2 Security Corporation  
50 Speen Street  
Framingham, MA 01701  
Telephone: (857) 998-7735.  
Facsimile: (508) 663-2512  
e-mail: [bgaiman@s2sys.com](mailto:bgaiman@s2sys.com)  
BG/pc